

Date: Sat, 25 Sep 93 04:30:08 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #347
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Sat, 25 Sep 93 Volume 93 : Issue 347

Today's Topics:

 "We must see your original license" requirement (2 msgs)
 Codeless Tech Debate (3 msgs)
 Codeless Technician (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 24 Sep 93 09:35:28 EST
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!math.ohio-state.edu!pacific.mps.ohio-state.edu!
ohstpy.mps.ohio-state.edu!miavx1!miavx3.mid.muohio.edu!clmorgan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: "We must see your original license" requirement
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <6374@catnip.berkeley.ca.us>, kc6sss@catnip.berkeley.ca.us (Andy)
writes:

> So I asked L. Ron Natalie, where in Part 97 this was stipulated and he
> said "It's on the back of Form 610".
>
> I happen to have a Form 610 here, dated September 1987 and nowhere
> on the back or front of it does it require the examinee to show
> the VEs the original copy of the license.

 I don't remember it being on the back of the 610,
 but I believe I remember it being in the VE's manual ...
 both ARRL and W5YI.

> Yes, I know that there is a newer Form 610 out just this year.

> However, VE teams have been requiring your original license for
> longer than that.

If it's been required for a long time, what's the
issue? Or is it merely a desire "to be different"
and challenge the procedure?

> It's a good way to screw someone up when they
> come back for their first upgrade, eh?

Why make a crack like this? Why would any VE or
VEC go out of their way to create another hurdle
for the examinee. Sure, you might know of "a case
once", but clearly that's not the norm as implied
herein.

> I would hazard a guess
> that one or more of the VECs suggested to the FCC that they add
> this requirement to the paperwork.

That, too, is doubtful. The tendency of man (VEs and
VECs included) is to reduce effort not add to it.

> Hasn't anyone ever heard of color photocopies?

I've heard of them but don't have one. What, by the
way, does it have to do with the issue? Certainly no
one would try to pass off a color-copy as the
original.

=====

Funny, in the few short years I've been affiliated
with exams, I've NEVER heard anyone challenge the
practice ... except on here!

There! I've said it maybe too much but it seems
to be such a trivial issue.

73 >< Carl
K8NHE

Date: 24 Sep 1993 03:32:00 GMT
From: drt@athena.mit.edu
Subject: "We must see your original license" requirement
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <6375@catnip.berkeley.ca.us> kc6sss@catnip.berkeley.ca.us (Andy) writes:

>|> I happen to have a Form 610 here, dated September 1987 and nowhere
>|> on the back or front of it does it require the examinee to show
>|> the VEs the original copy of the license.

>Do you have the destructions? Try reading them.

Only the instructions on the form itself. A single 8.5x11" piece of paper. The old "attach a photocopy or the original here" wording right at the top.

No, no. There are 4 pages of destructions that go with the 610. You can probably get them from FCC or ARRL. Didn't you ever want to know what a "major action" was? Anyway, the instructions for VEs, section II-b (3), on page 4 of the instructions, tell VEs to compare the original license with the photocopy and make sure nothing's altered.

>|> I would hazard a guess
>|> that one or more of the VECs suggested to the FCC that they add
>|> this requirement to the paperwork.
>|>
>|> Hasn't anyone ever heard of color photocopies?

>What do you want, a license as secure as a passport? (Fee: \$55, \$65 the
>time.) Maybe "just" a driver's license? (Imagine the wait! Don't move
>too often.)

Drivers licenses and passports are good enough to show to the cops to prove who you are. They should be good enough to show to everyone.

They're good for ID, just not element credit. Look in one of the callsign databases and see how many David Tuckers there are. There's another David R. Tucker in Georgia, a technician. None have my birthday, true, but that's not printed on the license, and not all acceptable forms of ID have birthday on them, anyway.

>And I have doubts that this was a VEC's idea.

As I wrote: "hazard a guess". I was speculating.

Sorry, I was unclear. I meant, "There's NO WAY IN HELL the VECs saddled everyone with this requirement!" IMHO. I have no proof.

>The point is that the originals are harder to *alter*.

But I can make a color photocopy of my original before I sign it, which is why I brought them up in the first place.

If you alter it first, it will still show up better than on your ordinary photocopy. Anyway, I'm not so sure this background wouldn't mix into a uniform yellow mash. Have you tried it to see? (Don't forget to do the back!) I'd be interested.

If you don't alter it, who cares?

Look, if you want to present an altered license bad enough, you'll find a way. Just apply to your local counterfeiter. Form 660 is cake in comparison to currency. The FCC will still catch you, so there's diminishing returns involved in additional security measures. It's your license. But if I don't follow those instructions, it's MY license, and I like my license. I'm not defending the requirement, just reading the FCC's mind about why it's there.

>I guess the FCC just wants us to cut down on their workload. They'll catch a >forged or altered license with their records.

Exactly. Sticking my neck out again, I would speculate that they don't bother to check signatures.

I guess they would if a question came up. I doubt they do routinely. WE'RE supposed to, though.

>But getting a CSCE back
>from an applicant is a chore, sometimes an embarrassing one.

What, you go to their house to reclaim them? This I've never heard of.

[Nervous dialing...one ring. two.] "Hello, is this KC6SSS? Hi. This the the head VE from the exams last week - Fine, thanks. Well, now that you mention it, there is something wrong. We have to void your upgrade to General, and we need to to return your upgrade certificate ... we graded your code exam incorrectly, it seems ..."

Hoo boy! VERY embarrassing.

An ugly scene, to be avoided at all costs. It has happened, but fortunately it's never happened to me. (You may as well return it. Your upgrade is void anyway, and you'll never get your ticket.)

--

|David R. Tucker

KG2S

drt@mit.edu|

| 'Most political sermons teach the congregation nothing except |
what newspapers are taken at the Rectory.' -C.S. Lewis

Date: Fri, 24 Sep 1993 22:06:37 GMT
From: spsgate!mogate!newsgate!nuntius@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Codeless Tech Debate
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <us6cac1w165w@amanda.jpunix.com> robert,
robert@amanda.jpunix.com writes:

>Unfortunately, the current "welfare mentality" doesn't reward effort.

ROBERT SINCE YOU WANT TO THROW FLAMES.....I HAVE NEVER RECEIVED A CENT
OF WELFARE MONEY IN MY LIFE. I SEE NO RELATION IN YOUR ARGUMENT TO A
WELFARE MENTALITY. I MADE A COMMENT THAT IS BOTH CURRENT TO THE ISSUE
AND IMHO (and by net opinion) LONG OVER DUE.

I work as hard as other amateurs. I would enjoy the privilege of HF but
unlike you I fear the bandwidth will disappear with those who have no
foresight to the needs of amateur radio. Like it or not we a minor user
of the spectrum and commercial carriers will be looking for any and all
reasons to regain the "squandered" bandwidth. Sticking your head in the
sand won't make the issue go away.

>How about just completing the current examination requirements?
>Contrary to popular opinion, it's NOT a big deal. It just requires
>effort.

I try to include many hobbies into the available amount of discretionary
time I have. I feel strong enough that I don't want to try and squeeze
the time required to go from 5wpm to 13 just so I can use the HF rig I
bought. I will have to learn the code.....BUT I expect I won't ever use
it, as it is a mode I have no interest in. Just as I have no interest in
packet.....This issue is not how much effort is required to learn CW
but is CW in the best interest of amateur radio.....

Date: Fri, 24 Sep 93 15:11:26 GMT
From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx!rcanders@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Codeless Tech Debate
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <us6cac1w165w@amanda.jpunix.com> robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:

>perry@fc.hp.com (Perry Scott) writes:

>

>> How about an equivalent three-level operator's test in some other modes
>> like packet, AMTOR, RTTY, etc?

>

>How about just completing the current examination requirements?

>Contrary to popular opinion, it's NOT a big deal. It just requires
>effort.

Not everyone is the same, some people can spell some can't. Some people can sing in tune some can't, some people can learn math some can't some people can memorize Morris some people have a great difficulty in memorizing things.

The code requirements were set to keep those who could not do high speed Morse from getting a license back in the old days when Morse was the only (95%) way of ham communication.

Now Morris is an ego trip of those who have no trouble in memorize meaningless junk. There are many OF who insist that the only to prove that you are worthy to be a ham is to demonstrate your ability at Morris dance ^H^H^H^H^H code.

>

>Unfortunately, the current "welfare mentality" doesn't reward effort.

NOT when the effort is just meaningless busy work like being able to do Morris code at more than 5 wpm.

Rod NONZO

--

Rod Anderson	"I do not think the United States government
rcanders@nyx.cs.du.edu	is responsible for the fact that a bunch of
	fanatics decided to kill themselves"
Clinton, Gore, gone in four	Slick Willie the Compassionate

Date: Thu, 23 Sep 93 23:18:05 CDT
From: korie1!cs.utexas.edu!swrinde!menudo.uh.edu!jpunix!unkaphaed!amanda!
robert@ames.arpa
Subject: Codeless Tech Debate
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

perry@fc.hp.com (Perry Scott) writes:

> How about an equivalent three-level operator's test in some other modes
> like packet, AMTOR, RTTY, etc?

How about just completing the current examination requirements?
Contrary to popular opinion, it's NOT a big deal. It just requires
effort.

Unfortunately, the current "welfare mentality" doesn't reward effort.

--Robert

Date: Thu, 23 Sep 1993 19:30:12 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!spool.mu.edu!uwm.edu!ginews!don@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Codeless Technician
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Sep21.072018.8810@nnnnpd2.cxo.dec.com> little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com
(nuts2u::little) writes:

...
>Couple of things. This sounds a lot like NIMBY. It also has little to
>nothing to do with the discussion as I haven't seen anyone propose changing
>the band plans. So CW ops would still enjoy their exclusive pieces of
>spectrum.

...
>Again, where was the proposal to change the band plans?

Please note before turning on your flame throwers....I am neither
espousing nor condemning a codeless HF license here. I think there
are considerations that need to be addressed. That is my intention.

IMHO, there is a big difference between the 'band plan' and FCC
regulations. FCC regulations currently divide the band up into
'phone' and 'cw' segments. The CW segments of most of the HF bands
are currently shared with RTTY, PACTOR, AMTOR, packet, ad infinitum.
It is difficult to operate CW in more than the lower 50kHz of the
bands because of these competing modes.

A band plan is only a suggestion, not an FCC regulation. The

'phone/cw' distinctions are part of the FCC regs.

If code is removed from the licensing requirements for HF operation (and maybe even if it is not), I believe serious consideration needs to be given to having the FCC regulations define band limits for all the various 'digital' modes of operation. There will ensue complete anarchy in the CW sub-bands if this does not happen.

A volume influx of new 'codeless generals' wanting to use HF packet and other digital modes will probably make the CW sub-band unusable due to crowding. This will likely have more affect on the digital modes than on CW operation as a CW operators ear is usually much more discriminating when there is QRM than the automated digital modes.

I don't like to see more government regulations, but we need something with more teeth than a 'band plan'.

Constructive Comments Only Please :-)

Donald D. Woelz, K9GR
GENROCO, Inc.
205 Kettle Moraine Drive North
Slinger, WI 53086 U.S.A.

Office Phone: 414-644-8700
K9GR @WB9TYT.#MKE.WI.USA.NOAM
k9gr@k9gr.ampr.org [44.92.1.48]
don@genroco.com

Date: 24 Sep 1993 03:38:57 GMT
From: drt@athena.mit.edu
Subject: Codeless Technician
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Sep23.193012.10281@genroco.com> don@genroco.com (Don Woelz) writes:

If code is removed from the licensing requirements for HF operation (and maybe even if it is not), I believe serious consideration needs to be given to having the FCC regulations define band limits for all the various 'digital' modes of operation. There will ensue complete anarchy in the CW sub-bands if this does not happen.

Anarchy In the CW sub-bands?!?! You must be kidding.
What about anarchy on 20 meter phone????

-drt, who is contemplating emigrating to the bottom of 40, permanently.

--

David R. Tucker KG2S drt@mit.edu

| 'Most political sermons teach the congregation nothing except |
what newspapers are taken at the Rectory.' -C.S. Lewis

Date: 24 Sep 1993 07:22 EDT

From: haven.umd.edu!cs.umd.edu!skates.gsfc.nasa.gov!nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov!

stocker@uunet.uu.net

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <6374@catnip.berkeley.ca.us>,

<1993Sep22.180148.21947@newsgate.sps.mot.com>,

<rcrw90-230993085219@node_142cf.aieg.mot.com>

Subject : Re: "We must see your original license" requirement

In article <rcrw90-230993085219@node_142cf.aieg.mot.com>, rcrw90@email.mot.com
(Mike Waters) writes...

>In article <1993Sep22.180148.21947@newsgate.sps.mot.com>,

>markm@bigfoot.sps.mot.com (Mark Monninger) wrote:

>

>

>> Ya know, I don't understand all the VEC/VE bashing I've seen lately. Why the
>> hell would a VE want to 'screw someone up'? And why would the VECs want to
>> create MORE paperwork?

>>

>> "Screw someone up"???? Sheesh...If that's a common perception, I'll find
>> something else to do with my Saturday mornings.

>

>I agree with you Mark (even if I haven't made it to as many sessions as I
>would like). I for one am a VE in order to contribute something to a
>pastime which has been a major positive effect on my life. I suspect that
>almost all VEs feel the same way. I have never even claimed the "expense
>reimbursement" due me for mileage, contributions of supplies etc. and as far
>as I know this too is true of most VEs.

>

>I too have other things I can do on Saturday mornings.

>

>--

>Mike Waters rcrw90@email.mot.com AA4MW@KC7Y.PHX.AZ.US.NA

As a non-VE I have to add my two cents. First I hope that the original
post was just an accidental insensitivity and not really meant. However,
I would add that in this area it is possible to get exams from VEs on all
days (including Sunday) and at a wide variety of hours. This convenience
provided by volunteer Extras et al is a tremendous advantage for those
of us taking tests and a great service to the community.

I have found that these testing teams are very helpful and as accomodating as is possible and maintain the integrity of the testing program. To even suggest that there is some sort of conspiracy to "screw up" an applicant is really "beyond the beyonds". If an error happens, it happens. We are all human and I know that I have made errors that I still cringe about when I recall them.

For those of you who do volunteer for the exams and dedicate your own free time for the rest of us --

!!!!!!!!!!!!!! THANKS !!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Erich
N3OXM

Date: 24 Sep 93 13:39:59 GMT
From: ogicse!emory!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CDnoqL.8C5@wang.com>, <1993Sep21.072018.8810@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com>, <1993Sep23.193012.10281@genroco.com>
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: Codeless Technician

In article <1993Sep23.193012.10281@genroco.com> don@genroco.com (Don Woelz) writes:

>
>IMHO, there is a big difference between the 'band plan' and FCC
>regulations. FCC regulations currently divide the band up into
>'phone' and 'cw' segments. The CW segments of most of the HF bands
>are currently shared with RTTY, PACTOR, AMTOR, packet, ad infinitum.
>It is difficult to operate CW in more than the lower 50kHz of the
>bands because of these competing modes.
>
>A band plan is only a suggestion, not an FCC regulation. The
>'phone/cw' distinctions are part of the FCC regs.

No, the FCC mode segments divide the bands between analog voice/SSTV and digital modes. CW is legal everywhere in the bands. It's only by gentlemen's agreement that the CW boys stay on the low end of the bands.

>If code is removed from the licensing requirements for HF operation
>(and maybe even if it is not), I believe serious consideration needs
>to be given to having the FCC regulations define band limits for all
>the various 'digital' modes of operation. There will ensue complete
>anarchy in the CW sub-bands if this does not happen.
>
>A volume influx of new 'codeless generals' wanting to use HF packet
>and other digital modes will probably make the CW sub-band unusable
>due to crowding. This will likely have more affect on the digital modes
>than on CW operation as a CW operators ear is usually much more
>discriminating when there is QRM than the automated digital modes.
>
>I don't like to see more government regulations, but we need
>something with more teeth than a 'band plan'.

I think you're wrong. Other countries, for example Canada, have no legal restrictions on modes by band segment. And it seems to work well. If we do want to legally segment the bands at all, I'd prefer that the segments be on the basis of occupied bandwidth rather than mode. In semblence to how it is now, we could have 3 bandwidth segments, 50 Hz, 800 Hz, and 2.1 kHz. Mode would not be an issue at all. My only problem with that plan is it allows no place for SS signals or AM. That's the problem with legal limits, they're so inflexible. I think we can handle any problems by voluntary bandplans. 160 meters has no legal mode segments, and it seems to work well. And VHF/UHF, aside from the CW only segment from 144.0 to 144.1 MHz, has no mode limits, other than some restrictions on pulse, but we manage to deal with that fairly well too.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV	"If 10% is good enough	gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems	for Jesus, it's good	uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way	enough for Uncle Sam."	emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244	-Ray Stevens	

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #347
